

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Regular Meeting**



**THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 2006
CITY HALL KIVA
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

PRESENT: Mark Gilliland, Chairman
Brian Davis, Vice-Chairman
William Howard, Commissioner
Matthew Taunton, Commissioner
Kelly McCall, Commissioner

ABSENT: J. David Hill, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT: Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager

OTHERS: Paul Basha, Morrison-Maierle, Inc.
Charlie Hales, HDR

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:14 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed the members present as stated above.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

COMMISSIONER MCCALL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE STUDY SESSION AND THE REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 15, 2006. COMMISSIONER HOWARD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0).

2. TRAFFIC CALMING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The Commission held a discussion regarding the proposed elements of the City's Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Manual and consideration of a resolution proposed by Commissioner Howard.

Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager, introduced Mr. Paul Basha of Morrison-Maierle, Inc. Ms. O'Connor remarked that staffs' goal for the meeting is to provide material to move the development of the Neighborhood Traffic Management process forward, to identify a time line and process to finalize that document, and to receive direction from the Commission to modify the current draft.

Mr. Basha addressed the Commission noting that traffic calming is a controversial issue across North America. Attitudes to traffic calming have changed over time because the public demands it. The entire process of traffic calming is designed to help a neighborhood. It is not a safety issue, but a quality of life issue. The current version of the City's traffic calming policy has been used with great success in many neighborhoods. The notable exception is Mountainview east of 96th Street. He stressed that staff have asked Morrison-Maierle, Inc. to assist in the refinement of a successful program. Many of the proposed modifications to the objectives came from Commissioner Howard's resolution.

Morrison Maierle, Inc. has made a careful review of 30 different policies from agencies across North America. Following the last Commission meeting, they determined that Scottsdale ranks 17. This reflects that the process is cumbersome, slow, and overly bureaucratic. He mentioned that approximately three dozen neighborhoods are currently requesting traffic calming--most of which have been waiting almost three years.

The program should be quantitative to determine the effectiveness of measures taken. However there is a subjective component to traffic calming, because it is a quality of life issue. The Commission does not have time to hear each traffic calming case. Over the past six years, the vast majority of traffic calming issues have been handled appropriately at the staff level. The recommendation is that the Commission should hear cases where the cost will exceed \$20,000.

Mr. Basha reviewed the other proposed recommendations.

Chairman Gilliland took comments from attendees who had filled out requests to speak on this issue. Mr. Norm Woodmansee of 9022 East Hualapai Drive, representing the Pima Acres Property Owners Association Board, addressed the Commission. Their community has been experiencing speeding problems, especially on Hualapai Drive and Sierra Pinta to the north. The posted speed limit is 25 mph but average speed is closer to 45 mph. For the last two to three years the neighborhood has followed City procedures. Despite having overwhelming evidence in support of permanent traffic calming measures, the City insists upon a "vote". They feel the system is stacked against them. He opined that this is a safety issue and appealed to the Commission for a remedy.

Mr. James Booth of 9202 East Hualapai Drive addressed the Commission, commenting that the current system is enabling people to break the law.

Commissioner McCall thanked the speakers, noting that one of the biggest problems is how to define the affected area. It's her understanding that for residents of the gated

communities adjacent to Pima Acres, these streets are their only access. She is concerned about the very high speeds reported on Hualapai Drive. She commented that she received an e-mail from a resident stating they were denied police enforcement of the speed limit and said she would do anything she could as a Commissioner to change that situation--residents have the right to be protected.

Commissioner McCall asked staff whether right of way exists to permit construction of sidewalks. Ms. O'Connor said that in the ESL area sidewalks are generally inconsistent with the community character. Staff does not feel that option is open.

Commissioner McCall suggested considering sidewalk construction. She cited that one of the goals of the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program is to ensure that proposed land uses and their associated travel demands do not negatively impact surrounding and adjacent residential neighborhoods. She noted that this community has been in place for approximately 50 years and asked if anyone had considered the impacts on Hualapai and Sierra Pinta when the gated communities were approved. The City, namely the Transportation Department, had failed to achieve that goal in this neighborhood.

Commissioner Howard observed that if the streets are as dangerous as the speakers presented, staff do not need to wait for a traffic calming finding. The Transportation Department has a responsibility to address safety issues.

Ms. O'Connor replied that speeding contributes to neighbors' concerns regarding safety. If there was a safety improvement to be made, staff would address that. Commissioner Howard noted that if it is a safety issue, the City needs to look at that seriously. He noted that he has driven in the neighborhood and fully understands why they have this problem. The road looks like a drag strip and drivers are tempted to speed. However, not all residents of the gated communities are speeders--they need access to their homes.

Mr. Booth returned to the podium. He stressed that residents are concerned with speeding drivers. Commissioner Howard asked whether the residents believe that the people in the gated communities should have no say in the issue of traffic calming. Mr. Booth noted that the speed limit was in force before the gated communities were developed. From the neighborhood perspective, the concern is not the volume of traffic, but the speed. Commissioner Howard remarked that he is concerned about who is allowed to participate in the discussion. An exchange ensued.

Ms. O'Connor interjected that Mr. Woodmansee and Mr. Booth had come to tonight's meeting to determine the process they would be operating under, and that the individual traffic problem would not be resolved at this meeting. Mr. Booth continued to state that the neighborhood has been involved in the process for several years and the City has been dragging its feet. Commissioner Howard noted his concern is the process and how the Commission can come to a conclusion. Mr. Woodmansee advised the Commission that when he tried to talk with the residents of the gated community, he was treated with insolence. He believes that the proximity to the freeway and the straight road design encourage speeding.

Commissioner Howard noted his concern is the process. The number one issue is safety. If this can be handled as a safety issue, that is one thing. On the other hand, if it is traffic calming, the entire neighborhood needs to come to a solution that they can buy into.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked staff to summarize the existing process. Ms. O'Connor replied that the current process requires a petition, whereas the proposed process presented tonight allows residents and staff to use other measures to involve the affected citizens.

Vice-Chairman Davis opined that the views of the residents in the gated communities have to be taken into consideration. On the other hand, the current policy that 65 percent of all residents must vote "yes" also seems extreme, when those who do not participate are counted as voting "no". A complicating factor is the number of people who own property on Sierra Vista and Hualapai but who live out of state.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked Mr. Porell for the traffic volumes on the two streets. Mr. Porell replied that each street carries approximately 600 vehicles per day. Vice-Chairman Davis noted it is disturbing that the City is unable to enforce traffic laws.

Chairman Gilliland remarked that Pima Acres is one traffic issue of many. The Pima Acres neighborhood has met the education requirements outlined on the City website. Enforcement is the next step and police have issued many citations. The third step is engineering. The current policy directs concerned citizens to obtain a traffic action request form, have it signed by at least ten residents, and the Traffic Engineering Division will then study neighborhood traffic conditions, apply minimum criteria and rank qualifying streets. Much of this has been accomplished. The final step is that the Traffic Engineering Division will meet with the neighborhood to discuss options.

Mr. Porell confirmed that staff evaluated both streets and they both qualify for traffic calming. The issue at hand in this neighborhood is whether the neighbors wish to proceed with the program under the current policies, which would require a petition process.

Chairman Gilliland opined that the signing, striping, and continuation of education enforcement could be implemented directly from the current policy. He wants to hear staff input on this topic as soon as possible. He believes that speed humps can be implemented based on the current policy. He does not see why this project and others on the list cannot be addressed now.

Mr. Porell replied that the Department has not identified any changes to signing, striping, or any simple modifications to the road that would have a direct influence on the speeding issue on the two streets. Concerning the continued education and enforcement, the Scottsdale Police Department is very responsive to neighbors' concerns about speeding. They are fully aware of the speeding issues on Hualapai and Sierra Pinta.

Chairman Gilliland inquired whether staff has considered the use of speed humps. Mr. Porell replied that the current policy on speed humps is that they be used only on local roadways. Speed humps would not be appropriate on either street because of the volume and nature of traffic. Ms. O'Connor added that the proposed new procedure attempts to address some issues by providing for temporary installations. The issues facing this neighborhood are somewhat unique because the only access points to the gated communities are on roads with residential frontage.

Replying to a further question from Chairman Gilliland, Mr. Porell explained that the volume is not appropriate for the use of speed humps. He opined that horizontal alignment shifts and speed tables would provide an effective solution to the problem.

Chairman Gilliland noted that the volume of traffic on the two streets in question falls within the parameters in the current speed hump policy. He opined that if the reason for delaying was to build consensus with the residents in the gated communities, that should be acknowledged.

Ms. O'Connor confirmed that and added she believes a temporary solution to the problem might be found while the consensus building process continues. She agreed that obstacles exist to using the petition process, which make this situation challenging and unique.

Chairman Gilliland inquired if there has been a meeting between the three groups. If not, he asked if the City would consider facilitating a meeting to outline the options available under the current policy and start utilizing some of the currently available options. Mr. Woodmansee reported that Mr. George Williams convened a meeting and that one resident from the gated communities attended. They discussed the issue in detail and the neighbors were overwhelmingly in favor of some type of traffic calming, except for the Tuscana resident. He noted that approximately 15 neighbors attended the meeting.

Chairman Gilliland asked what course of action was agreed upon. Mr. Woodmansee said that City staff advised them to follow the current guidelines. At that time the neighbors decided to contact an attorney. Chairman Gilliland said his understanding of the current policy is that it offers ample leeway. If staff does not see this as a contentious project, they can proceed in a number of ways. The next step would be to present concepts to the affected groups for feedback.

Ms. O'Connor replied that under the current policy, staff could come up with the concepts but would need to have the neighbors circulate a petition and get 65 percent of the affected area to support the measures.

Chairman Gilliland opined that step seven in the process has been reached. No petition would be required. To facilitate this, he felt there is no reason to depend on a draft plan that has never been consistently implemented. He suggested staff should go forward following the intent of the policy, which is to take concepts to the parties for their input.

Ms. O'Connor stated that to her knowledge, the only time they vacated that process was with the Mountainview case. Staff has drafted the proposed new policy document in order to provide staff and residents more leeway. Ms. O'Connor agreed with Chairman Gilliland that staff could prepare concepts. If the current policy is vacated, they could work with those who participate and determine how to achieve consensus in lieu of a petition. She noted that staff has contacted the residents of the gated communities.

One option would be to work with the Pima Acres residents to draft a plan, if the Commission takes action on that tonight. Staff will then convene a meeting of the affected neighborhoods including the gated communities and Pima Acres.

Mr. Booth asked for a definition of "negative impact." Chairman Gilliland replied that traffic calming measures frequently results in a slowdown of emergency response time. Mr. Booth opined that the Commission is attempting to preserve the right to speed and break the law. Chairman Gilliland noted that Ms. O'Connor has made a good offer of action. He asked staff to follow up on what was suggested and report back with a project update at the April meeting.

Commissioner Howard commented that his concern is the process. He did not intend to be inflammatory during the preceding discussion. An exchange followed with Mr. Booth who stressed that speeding is the issue in this case. He added he has not seen a police officer for at

least the past 60 days despite being on the regular police rotation. Ms. O'Connor undertook to follow up on the police rotation.

Chairman Gilliland opened more general discussion on Mr. Basha's presentation of traffic calming policies and procedures.

Commissioner McCall asked if there is goal for a timeframe so that neighborhood concerns are responded to in a timely manner.

Mr. Porell opined that responses have been timely, but completion has not. He agreed that timely resolution should be included in the goals and guidelines. Commissioner McCall inquired as to the progress of projects that are currently waiting. Mr. Porell said these are at different stages. Several of them are ready to go to construction. Commissioner McCall asked for an explanation of the lengthy time the process takes.

Mr. Porell explained that time spent on the the Mountainview discussions diverted staff efforts to those issues and to the process concerns identified, slowing up other projects.

Commissioner McCall asked Mr. Basha whether other cities he reviewed have timeframes. He replied they did not include a timeframe discussion. In a situation like Mountainview, consensus must be reached and he could not see how that could be regulated by a timeframe.

Commissioner McCall explained she is not trying to impose a hard and fast rule, but opined that since this area needs improvement it could be a goal. Ms. O'Connor concurred that people should have a reasonable expectation about the length of the process. Staff intends to bring back follow-up as part of the draft. Each situation is different, but timeframes should be reasonable.

One option would be to include a goal that the City intends to have a project under construction no later than a year from the initial request. Chairman Gilliland concurred that the Commissioners are concerned with public expectations and the frustration of not understanding the process.

Commissioner McCall asked whether EMS is involved in the process. Ms. O'Connor confirmed that EMS is part of the fire program, which reviews traffic calming devices and policies. Staff would like to move towards establishing a set of policies and identification of priority emergency routes, which would be more efficient than an individual review of every project.

Commissioner McCall asked Mr. Porell to confirm that traffic measurement on adjacent streets refers to residential streets. Noting that diversion of traffic associated with traffic calming devices is difficult to estimate, he confirmed that is the case; especially when there is the potential for closure of a street. Mr. Porell added that the goal is to solve the problem rather than push it around.

Commissioner McCall inquired whether a temporary installation could be part of the neighborhood speed awareness program. Commissioner McCall replied that in some communities, speed humps are used on residential streets. The ideal situation is to use as a temporary installation a measure that is likely to be a permanent solution.

Commissioner McCall remarked that she would like to add to the process document that the Transportation Commission could act as a resource.

Noting that the questionnaire is much less detailed than the current one, Commissioner McCall asked whether staff attempt to educate residents as to whether it is worthwhile initiating the process. Mr. Porell responded that staff would take the questionnaire as the initial point of contact. Mr. Basha, who drafted the new questionnaire, added it is pointed to specific issues and intended to be simple to encourage citizens to complete it. The expectation is that all this information will be on the website so that residents would have some concept of traffic calming before starting the process.

In the ensuing discussion, staff clarified that the initial petition process is being simplified. Once the speed awareness program is completed, residents can make a simple request using the traffic action request form.

Commissioner McCall inquired whether residents would continue to pay for speed humps. Ms. O'Connor said this has not been addressed in the draft. Many cities pay at least a portion of the cost of speed humps.

In answer to a further question from Commissioner McCall, Mr. Basha said the intent is that there would be one measurement of the street before a speed awareness program is initiated. Commissioner McCall noted that frequently, speed awareness programs influence driving in a positive way so the traffic data may be influenced by improved driver behavior resulting from the speed awareness program. Mr. Basha agreed. The timing of the use of the speed awareness program needs to be clearly identified.

Commissioner McCall asked about the criteria. Mr. Basha replied that preponderance of evidence was a key concern in their discussions. The intent is to have several different measures and base the decision upon an evaluation of all information. Commissioner McCall noted this should be clarified in the document.

In response to a further question by Commissioner McCall, Mr. Basha stated that some of the criteria have been intentionally deleted. One of the problems with the current draft policy is that there are separate criteria for separate classifications of roads.

Commissioner McCall asked the other Commissioners for their opinion on the criteria with respect to percentages of vehicles exceeding the speed limit, which to her seemed low. Mr. Basha commented there was extensive debate on this and it is a preponderance of the evidence issue.

Commissioner McCall remarked that the maximum traffic volume has been raised from the previous policy. She asked Mr. Porell what the volume is on Cactus where the roundabouts were installed. He reported that the highest volume east of 96th Street is about 7,000 vehicles per day.

Determining the affected area is an issue the Commission has struggled with in the past. Commissioner McCall noted this is not mentioned in the new document. Mr. Basha confirmed that they are continuing to struggle with that definition and do not have a recommendation at this time. Commissioner McCall commented that another concern is the apathetic resident who will not sign a petition. She asked whether these could be counted as a "don't care" vote rather than a "no" vote. Mr. Basha recalled that several years ago this was tried and found not to be as helpful as expected.

Chairman Gilliland asked why the petition option is being offered. Mr. Basha replied that the hope is to make the program more responsive and quicker.

Commissioner McCall noted that the neighborhood meeting comes before involving emergency responders. Mr. Basha explained that traffic calming concepts would be discussed on a regular basis with the Fire and Police Departments, so the opinions of those agencies would be known at the time of the neighborhood meeting. Emergency response staff might attend the neighborhood meetings.

Commissioner McCall noted that when signage is posted, the public becomes aware of traffic calming concerns. She opined that placing public signs should be included in the process. She asked what would happen at stage 7 (c) if everyone in the affected area does not make the same choice. Mr. Basha noted this is part of the dialogue and that they do not recommend voting, because that entails determining who is eligible to vote. Commissioner McCall cautioned that not defining this could lead to problems. Mr. Basha explained that most of the time neighborhoods come quickly to a consensus. The process is a dialogue with a spectrum of alternatives. One of the underlying desires is to make it easy to use, flexible, and to keep exceptions from becoming the rule.

Chairman Gilliland asked how community consensus would be gauged. Mr. Porell described a meeting held the previous day and the process used. Ms. O'Connor added that the point about signage was well taken.

Commissioner McCall noted that in the current process, if a traffic-calming project is denied, the expectation is that residents will not re-apply for one year. In the new draft, this has been omitted. Mr. Basha and City staff confirmed that this was an intentional deletion.

Ms. O'Connor confirmed that although there is no page 13 in the document, this was an error and that the entire document text is included in the packet. Commissioner McCall commented that the document should contain some provision for follow-up by staff and suggested having a date field on the questionnaire as well as on the petition. Chairman Gilliland echoed Commissioner McCall's suggestion on follow-up. Traffic speed and volume data would be particularly helpful and will enable them to learn how effective various measures are.

Ms. O'Connor noted that these are objectives that are not fleshed out in the document. Mr. Basha added that Scottsdale has done a remarkable job of collecting before and after data. He mentioned that incoming initial questionnaires are date-stamped by the City as they are received.

Commissioner Howard expressed concern on the issue of affected areas. There is a general public interest in finding a realistic way to identify affected areas. Petitions are tough because they are not definitive. If the decision is taken to use petitions, the City should write the wording and include a fact sheet to accompany it. Commissioner Howard opined that responses from the Fire and Police Departments need to be formal.

He concluded by stating that the biggest issue is the problem of public outreach and participation. Rather than thinking exclusively in terms of easily measured parameters, he opined there is a need to think carefully about how to get a meaningful measure of neighborhood participation. Possibly a defined community working group could be established once a project is under way. The success or failure of a traffic-calming project is a social issue, not a technical issue. He noted that he has a few suggestions for the wording of the document, which he will bring to staff later.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked how the percentage of through traffic is relevant for horizontal realignment but not relevant to vertical alignment solutions. Mr. Basha explained that the

through traffic issue is a concern with the horizontal realignment and the closure, through traffic is dramatically affected. These measures should only be employed when it is determined that there is a through traffic issue. With vertical realignment, the volume of through traffic is not affected.

Vice-Chairman Davis echoed Commissioner McCall's request to include goals and a level of expectation. On the topic of petitions, he opined that the Commission is trying to create a document that will satisfy simple and complex projects. He believes that a mechanism is needed to require a different level of public participation in the most complex cases.

Mr. Basha remarked that Commissioner Howard's proposal of a community-working group was a similar concept. He and Ms. O'Connor had experience with a controversial traffic calming process in Tempe where a community-working group worked extremely well. He concurred that they need to come up with criteria for when a project is likely to be controversial.

Chairman Gilliland expressed interest in the developer's stipulation. Since the major part of the document deals with residential concerns, he queried whether this belongs in the document. Ms. O'Connor noted she believes this is a typographical error. Mr. Meinhart noted there have been occasions when developers used traffic calming as a marketing tool. Chairman Gilliland noted that the language is somewhat ambiguous.

Chairman Gilliland asked staff if consideration has been given to staffing aspects of dealing with the backlog. Ms. O'Connor responded that in the past, one or two staff members in Traffic Engineering worked on traffic calming. Recently more staff from the Traffic Engineering and Transportation Planning divisions have become involved as needed, and consultants have been hired to assist. Chairman Gilliland commented that the public involvement portions of the proposed new process could mean an increase in work for City staff.

Chairman Gilliland inquired what the next step in the process would be. Ms. O'Connor offered that staff would take the information received at this meeting and return in May with an edited draft proposal that attempts to address all the issues. An alternative would be to hold a Work Study Session in April with a rough draft of the proposal. The May meeting could then review a more refined version prior to scheduling a public meeting. Noting that they are faced with a detailed task, Chairman Gilliland agreed it might be wise to hold a Work Study session.

Chairman Gilliland added that the City's Transportation website needs some clean-up.

COMMISSIONER HOWARD NOTED THAT A RESOLUTION IS ON THE TABLE. DUE TO THE DYNAMIC NATURE OF THE TOPIC AND THE HOUR, HE SUGGESTED TABLING THAT RESOLUTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AT A LATER MEETING. COMMISSIONER MCCALL SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0).

3. PROPOSITION 400 STATUS

Review of Proposition 400 projects in Scottsdale and status of design or implementation.

At the suggestion of Ms. O'Connor, Chairman Gilliland agreed to defer this information item to the next meeting.

4. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM BUDGET

A follow up discussion was held of questions regarding presentation of the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget.

Commissioner Howard publicly thanked Mr. Meinhart for his time and patience in helping the Commission understand the Capital Improvement Projects. He personally now has a much better understanding of the process. If he were to vote on the item that was voted on at the last meeting, he would now vote "yes."

Mr. Meinhart addressed the Commission, noting that future CIP presentations will include additional information to make this matter easier to understand. His presentation focused on projects initiated under a construction contract, which sometimes involve more than one CIP funding source. He noted that a spreadsheet in the packet (Capital Improvement Program Draft FY 2006-07 to 2010) identifies projects with multiple funding sources, as well as those which are anticipated to be standalone projects.

Commissioner McCall thanked Mr. Meinhart for revising the spreadsheet to make it easier to follow. She inquired about the budget for the 96th Street project. Mr. Meinhart said that the original budget was for construction only. It is his understanding that the project is on budget and on track for completion by the end of the month.

Chairman Gilliland read a comment card from Nan Nesvig, 6144 North 77th Place who did not wish to speak on item number two. She wrote, "Traffic calming affects all residents in Scottsdale, not solely those in the general vicinity of the proposed calming. Before decisions are made or even considered, the City must gather significant public input. There are suitable locations for calming but in main thoroughfares it is unsuitable. We must strive to move traffic, not prohibit its flow. A working group solely of citizens must be formed to represent opinions of our city. The City must be well informed and all documents published. Decisions must be made by public vote, not by a select few."

5. TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

Ms. Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner, addressed the Commission on the progress of the Transportation Master Plan. Highlights of her presentation included a discussion of testing and data gathering, and meetings and events scheduled to publicize the Transportation Master Plan. Ms. Huish noted that the Planning Commission initiated a General Plan amendment to better coordinate the community mobility element with the Transportation Master Plan findings. The Planning Commission is particularly concerned with the high capacity transit corridor, which was not part of the original General Plan. Staff is taking every opportunity to get information

out about meetings, workshops and how to become an active participant. An information workshop is scheduled for March 30th at 5:00 p.m. at the Community Design Studio. A three-day planning workshop is scheduled immediately before the next Commission meeting in April.

Ms. O'Connor added that the possibility of a joint meeting between the Planning Commission and the Transportation Commission had been raised. Staff will attempt to find a convenient date to schedule a joint meeting.

Commissioner McCall wondered if Mr. Hales' data could be presented in written form. Mr. Hales undertook to circulate summaries of the stakeholder interviews and other findings as work progresses.

Commissioner McCall inquired how membership in the community-working group is growing. Ms. Huish replied that membership is approximately 25 people and noted that a number of organizations are anxious to bring in additional members. The added diversity of viewpoints strengthens the group. Commissioner McCall opined that this is something to be proud of and suggested posting that on the website.

Commissioner McCall reported she had done some research based on her reading of the north-south corridor study. She requested that information be posted on the website as part of the Transportation Master Plan, given that this bears on Scottsdale's ability to link into the regional light rail system.

Ms. O'Connor explained that staff provided the background from the executive summary of the Major Investment Study that resulted in the City Council adopting the corridor but not the technologies. At approximately the time the study was completed, the alignment of the central Phoenix-East Valley corridor changed. Staff is looking at the same issues that a Tempe official had identified to Commissioner McCall. The Scottsdale staff team is attempting to coordinate with a Valley Metro Rail System Configuration Study, and with Tempe and Valley Metro Rail on other transit-planning efforts.

Ms. O'Connor added that the SkySong project changes the context and possible alignment of a high capacity transit corridor on Scottsdale Road and makes the need for a direct connection to the ASU campus a bigger consideration than it was at the time when the information that was gathered recommended an alignment on Curry Road.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked Ms. Huish to outline the mobility element of the General Plan. Ms. Huish summarized that in the last update it was more of a policy document than a working Master Plan document. The Master Plan will flow from the global policy goals and objectives stated in the mobility element. She confirmed that the joint meeting would be a good opportunity for the Transportation and Planning Commissions to discuss this topic.

A discussion ensued on the timing and agenda of the joint meeting.

6. CURRENT TRANSPORTATION PROJECT UPDATES

Ms. O'Connor noted that the regional bus and Dial-A-Ride contractor was terminated. A new contractor, ATC(Veolia), took over the service with no gap. On April 7th, the City Council Budget Sub-Committee will review the Transportation budget. The first free community bike ride, "Cycle of the Arts," will take place on April 23rd. All are welcome to participate.

Citations began on February 22 with regard to Loop 101 photo enforcement. Approximately 16,256 warning notices have been mailed; 2,411 citations have been filed with the court; and 2,946 corporate notices have been mailed. The Technical Evaluation Committee met recently.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked what a corporate notice is. Mr. Porell explained that if speeding violation occurs and the photo does not match the description on file with the Department of Motor Vehicles, the photo is sent to the registered owner of the vehicle asking them to identify the driver.

In reply to a question by Chairman Gilliland, Ms. O'Connor stated that staff is working with a community working group on developer funded traffic management on Chaparral west of Scottsdale Road.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Gilliland noted he received a lengthy communication from Ms. Susan Wood of 9530 East Yucca Street, and requested that this be included in the meeting minutes. The letter is addressed to HDR Engineering with Ms. Wood's input on the Transportation Master Plan Study.

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENT

Commissioner McCall commended staff on the excellent summary of the construction seminar. Mr. Meinhart commented staff at Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) had written it.

Commissioner McCall noted there is an ADA Coordinators conference scheduled for April. She would like Ms. Astin to report back at the May meeting. Commissioner McCall also commended Mr. Meinhart for his patience with the Commission and his dedication to community service.

Chairman Gilliland thanked staff for being responsive to the Commissioners' questions regarding Pima Acres. This is a difficult issue and he opined there was a good exchange at the meeting. Staff's openness and willingness to answer questions help citizens feel their concerns are being heard.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A/V Tronics, Inc.

***NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.

Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on _____